

PROPOSED BOATING FACILITY PROGRAM EVALUATION INSTRUMENT (SCORING CRITERIA)

Boating Facilities Program - Criteria Summary					
Score	#	Item	A-D-P	Mult/Max.	Policy
Team	1	Need	A-D-P	3 / 15	A-1
Team	2	Site suitability	A-D-P	3 / 15	A-1, C-2
Team	3a	Urgency	A	2 / 10	A-3,C-5
Team	3b	Project Design	D	2 / 10	C-1, C-4
Team	3c	Planning success (A&E only)	P	2 / 10	B-5
Team	4	Cost benefit	A-D-P	2 / 10	A-2, A-3
Team	5	Boating experience	A-D-P	2 / 6	A-2
Team	6	Boats on trailers	A-D-P	2 / 10	B-5
Team	7	Readiness	A-D-P	5	B-5
IAC score	8	Matching shares including non government contributions	A-D-P	4	C-3
IAC score	9	Proximity to people	A-D-P	1	RCW
IAC score	10	GMA preference (local agencies)	A-D-P	0	RCW
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE, ALL CATEGORIES			Local A-D-P	= 76	
			State A-D-P	= 73	

IAC score= Question scored in advance by IAC staff.
 Team = Question scored by evaluation team.
 Item = Question title or subject.
 A = Acquisition proposal.
 D = Development or renovation proposal.
 P = Plan proposal (architecture-engineering or permit related)
 Mult/Max.= Multiplier and maximum points possible for this question
 Policy = See IAC's *Boating Facilities Program Plan* (11/03).

Proposed Scoring Criteria

1. Need. Is the project needed?

All proposals.

Consider the goal of the project and how it relates to the service area:

- ▶ **Inventory of existing sites and facilities**
- ▶ **Physical condition of the inventory**
- ▶ **Unserved or under-served populations**
- ▶ **Amount of use of existing sites**
- ▶ **Potential use of proposed sites**
- ▶ **How the project meets the need**
- ▶ **Is the project named by location or type as a priority in an adopted plan? (For example, a community's comprehensive plan, shoreline/port/waterfront access plan, park/open space plan, CIP/CFP, etc.)**

For example, a proposal for a new site in a large city with few existing sites would seem likely to fill a substantial need and could receive a high score. A proposal for improving a geographically remote site accessing an important sport fishery in high demand could also receive a high score.

Evaluators award 0-5 points that are later multiplied by 3.

Revised February 1997

2. Site Suitability. Is the site well-suited for the intended recreational uses?

All proposals.

Consider the following:

- ▶ **The site's size and location**
- ▶ **Topography and soil conditions**
- ▶ **Existing facilities or development (if any)**
- ▶ **Adjacent land uses**
- ▶ **Natural features or attractions (such as productive fishing locations)**
- ▶ **Alternatives that may have been considered.**

In general, sites more suitable for the intended uses should get higher scores.

Evaluators award 0-5 points, that are later multiplied by 3.

3a. Urgency. How urgent is the need for IAC funding? *Acquisition proposals only.*

If IAC funding is not made available, will public access or use be lost? Consider the availability of alternatives. Where none exist, the significance of IAC funding may be higher. IAC funding shall augment, not replace, other sources of funding available to a sponsor or applicant.

No evidence presented.....(0 points)

Minimal urgency: site opportunity appears to be in no immediate danger of a loss in quality or to public use in the next two years..... (Low score)

Actions are under *consideration* that *could* result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for future public use (Medium score)

Actions will be taken that will result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for future public use..... (High score)

Evaluators award 0-5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

3b. Project Design. Is the proposal appropriately designed for the intended use? *Development only.*

IAC policy rewards design standards and construction techniques intended to maximize service life, minimize routine maintenance, and avoid environmental impacts.

For example, if users of a proposed boat ramp can be expected to be power loading, solid concrete ramp construction may be more appropriate than concrete plank construction. In harsh marine conditions, steel piling or concrete could be expected to have a longer service life than timber piling.

Evaluators should consider design and construction elements such as:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| ▶ Materials and specifications | ▶ User friendly elements |
| ▶ Innovative/creative elements | ▶ Aesthetics |
| ▶ Future maintenance needs | ▶ Risk management |
| ▶ Space relationships | ▶ Accurate cost estimates |
| ▶ Barrier free considerations | ▶ Environmental impacts. |

Evaluators award 0-5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

3c. Planning success. What potential does this project have to successfully complete the required documents needed to start a development project? *Planning Only.*

Evaluators are asked to judge how likely it is that the project will result in a capital development project that can be completed in less than 3 years. The results of the planning project include construction-ready documents and permit applications for the subsequent development project submitted to regulatory agencies. Factors to consider include:

- ▶ **Cost-effective design and construction standards**
- ▶ **Site conditions that might require extraordinary or unique A&E efforts**
- ▶ **The results of public involvement**
- ▶ **Whether design approaches are untested or have been successfully tested**
- ▶ **The experience or expertise of the organization that will do the work**
- ▶ **The complexity or feasibility of environmental mitigation that could be required.**

Evaluators award 0-5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

4. Cost-benefit. Do the benefits of the project outweigh the costs?

All proposals. Having reviewed the technical and other merits of the project proposal, evaluators are now asked to determine its overall cost-benefit.

- ▶ *Cost* can be more than dollars: it can also be unacceptable harm to the environment, or something that causes unnecessary ill-will for the boating public.
- ▶ *Benefit* is the gain realized with the requested level of public investment: it can be gain for boaters, gain for the environment, gain for the general public, or other gain.

Proposals demonstrating greater net benefits should score higher than proposals with limited value, or with value at too great a cost.

Evaluators award 0-5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

**5. Boating experience. How will the project affect the boating experience?
All proposals.**

Boaters are increasingly concerned about the quality of the boating experience. Although the meaning of a quality experience is highly personal, IAC suggests that evaluators consider the complex relationships among:

- ▶ **The size and location of the water body to be accessed**
- ▶ **The number and types of boats currently using that water body**
- ▶ **The traditional or historic use of the water body**
- ▶ **The number and types of additional boats that could gain access**
- ▶ **Current and expected boat speeds.**

Evaluators are asked to consider the overall potential impact of a proposal.

A proposal that will harm or disrupt a quality boating experience should receive *negative* points..... (minus 2 or minus 1)

Proposals that will not change the boating experience should probably get a zero. (0)

Proposals that will enhance or improve quality boating should score positive points. (1 to 3)

Evaluators award -2 (minus two) to +3 (plus three) points that are later multiplied by 2.

6. Boats on trailers. How well will the project help launch and retrieve boats with trailers? *All proposals.*

The boating facilities program is intended to facilitate physical access to water for recreational boating. Approximately 80 percent of the motorized recreational boating fleet depends on the use of trailers to get in and out of the water.

Evaluators award 0-5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

7. Readiness. Is the project ready to proceed? *All proposals.*

IAC policy is to encourage proposals that are ready for immediate implementation. That is, an applicant should be ready to start work as soon as a project agreement is signed.

- ▶ **Acquisition proposals that have completed negotiations should get a higher score than a proposal for which negotiations are still underway or have not yet started.**
- ▶ **Development proposals with permits in hand should score higher than proposals that are in the process of securing permits.**
- ▶ **An architecture and engineering (A&E) proposal may merit a high score if it is clear that work on the permit or plan can start immediately.**

Evaluators award 0-5 points; there is no multiplier.

SCORED BY IAC STAFF

**8. Matching Shares. To what extent will the applicant match any IAC grant funds with contributions from its own resources?
*Local agencies only.***

This question is scored by IAC staff based on information submitted as part of the application. To qualify, contributions must be eligible for BFP funding, and may include:

- ▶ **Cash, the value of donated labor, equipment, and materials.**
 - ▶ **The value of donated land or lesser interests in land, except when the interest is currently owned by the project applicant or by a public agency.**
- a. 0 to 25 percent of project's value will be contributed from applicant's resources.....(0 points)
 - b. 25.1 to 45 percent of project's value will be contributed from applicant's resources (1 point)
 - c. 45.1 to 55 percent of project's value will be contributed from applicant's resources(2 points)
 - d. 55.1 percent or more of project's value will be contributed from applicant's resources(3 points)
 - e. If an applicant can demonstrate that its matching share includes non-government contributions equivalent to 10% or more of the total project cost, staff will add 1 point to the score assigned above.

IAC staff awards a maximum of 4 points; there is no multiplier.

SCORED BY IAC STAFF

9. Proximity to people. Is the project site located in a populated area?
All proposals.

IAC policy is to give funding preference to projects located in populated areas. Populated areas are defined (RCW 43.51.380) as a town or city with a population of 5,000 or more, or a county with a population density of 250 or more people per square mile.

Is the project located in an area meeting this definition?

No 0 points
Yes 1 point

IAC staff awards a maximum of 1 point; there is no multiplier.

SCORED BY IAC STAFF**10. GMA PREFERENCE. Has the applicant made progress toward meeting the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA)?**

RCW 43.17.250 (GMA-preference required.)

State law requires that:

- (1) Whenever a state agency is considering awarding grants to finance public facilities, it shall consider whether the applicant^[1] has adopted a comprehensive plan and development regulations as required by RCW 36.70A.040 ("state law").
- (2) When reviewing such requests, the state agency shall accord additional preference to applicants^[1] that have adopted the comprehensive plan and development regulations. An applicant^[1] is deemed to have satisfied the requirements for adopting a comprehensive plan and development regulations if it:
 - ▶ **Adopts or has adopted within the time periods specified in state law;**
 - ▶ **Adopts or has adopted by the time it requests a grant or loan; or**
 - ▶ **Demonstrates substantial progress toward adopting within the time periods specified in state law. An agency that is more than six months out of compliance with the time periods has not demonstrated substantial progress.**
- (3) A request from an applicant^[1] planning under state law shall be accorded no additional preference based on subsection (2) over a request from an applicant^[1] not planning under this state law.

This question is pre-scored by IAC staff based on information obtained from the state Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development, GMA Division. To qualify for the current grant cycle, the GMA comprehensive plan and development regulations must be completed by IAC's Technical Completion Deadline.

- a. The applicant does *not* meet the requirements of RCW 43.17.250(minus 1 point)
- b. The applicant *meets* the requirements of RCW 43.17.250 (0 points)
- c. The applicant is a nonprofit organization, state or federal agency (0 points)

IAC staff subtracts a maximum of 1 point; there is no multiplier.

^[1] County, city, town, and special district applicants only. This segment of the question does not apply to nonprofit organizations or state and federal agency applicants.